Information Broker and Communication Pattern Among the Poor in the Government 5.0 Era

Rutiana Dwi Wahyunengseh[1], Sri Hastjarjo[2], Tri Mulyaningsih[3]
Regional Development Information Center, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia[1]
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia[2]
Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia[3]

{rutianadwi@staff.uns.ac.id[1], sri.hastjarjo@staff.uns.ac.id[2], trimulyaningsih@staff.uns.ac.id[3]}

Abstract. This paper studies the risks of ICT-based public policy communication for the poor in the Government 5.0 era. The aim of this study is to explain the level of internet-based media literacy, the communication pattern, and key components in the process of understanding public policy information by the poor. Conducted in a city which has been awarded as Smart City of The Year 2016-2018. Samples were taken from the poor families in the local community unit from 3 sub districts. The data was collected by questionnaire and analyzed using Social Network Analysis and Actor Network Theory. This study finds that public policy communication using internet-based technology has potential to marginalized the poor and make them more dependent to information brokers. The level of online media among the poor is very low because the device is still too expensive for them to purchase. Majority of the poor receives public information from face-to-face forums and the need for information brokers is high. The novelty of this study lays in the emergence of the paradox that in a city that is awarded as a Smart City we find the group that are disconnected from the online media, and therefore unexposed to the public policy disseminated by online media. This study concludes that a Smart City, as a representation of Government 5.0, has potential to marginalize the poor to be "non-smart" people. This study give suggestions for the local government to remidy the paradox.

Keywords: Government 5.0; communication network; information broker; poverty eradication

1 Introduction

This article addressed the risk of information technology-based public policy communication in government 5.0 era to poor group. Government 5.0 era is a public governance in society 5.0 era. The main actor in Society 5.0 is mankind, doing creative works by utilizing technology to solve social issues while maintaining the harmonious relationship with nature [1]. Government 5.0 era as the digital government era ascertains the utilization of ICT for communication, information, public service, and development governance management [2]. Digital government emphasizes on public participation in data collection and

ICA 2019, October 16-17, Bali, Indonesia

DOI 10.4108/eai.16-10-2019.2304349

utilization. Digital government [3] is combined with internet and application of social network assumed to expand public service inclusiveness. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the formal, procedural, and centralistic characteristics of bureaucracy can also affect bureaucrats in government 5.0 era so that the government's communication and information pattern pays less attention to inclusiveness, due to centralism [4].

This article builds on the findings of some studies showing that there is still digital divide in the use of internet-based devices [5]. Digital divide represents the gap between individual, household, business, and geographical areas at different social-economic levels related to access information and communication technology (ICT), and in the term of internet use for various activities [6]. Digital divide has an implication to the increased economic gap. Digital divide makes the advantage of digital development not enjoyed evenly. Although generally internet penetration reaches 64.8% in 2019, digital divide also occurs in Indonesia [7]. Ministry of National Development Planning or National Development Planning Agency admits that the group capturing the advantages of digital economy and industrial revolution making their wealth increasing [8][9]. Digital divide is experienced by poor group, meanwhile, society 5.0 is inherent to digital life. Thus, the poor group deals with the challenge of survivability in facing society 5.0 and government 5.0 eras. Poor group is vulnerable to the marginalization from ICT access and utilization in Government 5.0 era. Inadequate access to internet means the delayed information acquisition, the inhibited access, and finally, the inhibition in getting benefit. The causes of poor group's exclusivity from ICT are, among others: (i) no device and internet access due to high cost; (ii) skill using technology and language understanding [10][11].

It is this digital divide that leads to the need for local information broker. The identification of Information Broker's important role refers to a Systematical Literature Review conducted by Bornbaum et al [12]. From some previous studies, it can be seen that Information Broker is affected by personal brokers' attribute, and preparedness of stakeholders involved in the cooperation. Information broker in poor society has ever been studied by Fisher and Vogel [13] using the term intermediaries. It serves as the intermediary of information flow and to maintain the dissemination of information around development issues. In addition to positive role of information broker, there is a trap that can results in negative excess. Structural Holes Theory explains that broker can get benefit as it has control and access to knowledge in a social network, because it serves to fill in the vacuum of relationship between and individual and another in a social networking. The excess arising is the psychological sense of power, so that broker feels that it has larger power or not confident, thereby reducing sensitivity to the difficulty encountered by the group needing to be facilitated to close the gap of information and access among policy decision makers [14][15][16].

2 Method

The research was conducted in Magelang, a city in Central Java Province, Indonesia, that has gotten award for Smart City in 2016-2018. The sample (N=151) of respondents was taken from one Neighborhood Association (RT) unit, with the largest number of poor family representing every sub district in the city. Data exploration was carried out using questionnaire and interview. Social Network Analysis (SNA) in this study was conducted based on the result of questionnaire distributed to respondents belonging to poor group in three poorest kelurahans (villages) in the research site. Questionnaire was responded to using guided self-administered method, in which the respondents respond to the questionnaire under an author's

guidance. The data collected was then processed using Ucinet version 6.68 program, and social network visualization occurring was processed using Netdraw version 2.16B program.

Social Network Analysis (SNA) is used to explain information source and information requester in its community network. This analysis helps find who will become information broker and how the dynamic of role is, explored from follow-up interview. SNA in the study is intended to explain that government with its poverty policy and information dissemination media live in community group network, either poor or non-poor group. Whether or not the networking will finally develop and be effective is dependent on the relation between actors highly affected by benefit and loss the actors will obtain in the networking. Therefore, the analysis in this study was conducted using actor networking analysis theory. Actor Network Theory (ANT) assumes that all actions are interconnected and all factors are interdependent and interconnected, thereby resulting in network. The concept of network focuses the social relation not only between human actors but also between non-human actors. ANT explains that the process of adaptation between human and technology occurs, exactly between technological construction and value order contained in its use relations, so that in line with equality and social justice principles that has been established by mankind [17][18].

3 Results and Discussions

This section is presented to answer the problems of research: (1) what the problems are dealt with by poor group in responding to the internet-based communication model established by government to community; (ii) how the literacy of poor groups is in the term of dissemination of public policy information based on internet and new media; (iii) what communication pattern and key components do contribute to the process of interpreting information among poor group.

What are the problems dealt with by poor group in responding to information technology-based communication and new media established by government to the society? The research site is the city that has gotten award from central government as Smart City for small town category in 2015-2018. This city has 9,590 poor populations (7.87%) with poverty line of IDR 476,562. The city government in the research site has adopted website-based information and communication technology, digital service and likewise social media, including: (i) City government's official web and OPD to distribute information to the public quickly; (i) the use of information system to improve service speed and accuracy, such as e-KTP (electronic identity card), SIMPUS (SIM PUSKESMAS), licensing, SIM Keuangan, DataGO, and etc; (iii) free-access WIFI & Internet in some public places; (iv) cooperation is also established between sellers and some banks or cashless payment application with QR code that can be used with smartphone application in some culinary centers; (viii) CCTV installation in strategic/vulnerable places; (viii) online GIS (web)-based RTRW monitoring facilitating the public/the investor to check a plot of land in Magelang City, particularly for its allocation and use.

From the data aforementioned, it can be seen that the infrastructure of digital government 5.0 has been prepared. From google searching, 10 Facebook official active accounts of city government, 4 twitter account, and 3 instagram accounts are found. In addition to government's preparedness, there have been 2 communities developing IT-based community, Blogger and IT Villages. They teach the people how to run online business and to utilize social media for networking purpose. Although the government has run some features of digital government and some communities have developed IT community, the study found

that information on poverty alleviation policy has not been accessible inclusively to poor group. Information on poverty and poverty alleviation policy has not been presented in a specific directory. There has been no special group in all types of online media type discussing poverty issues specifically.

How prepared is the digital government to be identified by poor citizen community? The profile of poor population's introduction and connectivity to social media and website-based information media held by city government is explained by the following data. About 151 respondents were used in this research, as the populations of 3 RT of 3 sub districts with the largest number of poor citizens in individual sub districts in the city. Out of those populations, 42% have internet-supported handphone (cellular phone), meaning that digital divide still occurs in the population with the large proportion of poor family. Social network using WA group media at RT (neighborhood association) level is intended to men group only, while women group does not have it. From the populations, it can be identified the owners of social media account as follows: (1) 26% facebook, (ii) 16% instagram, and (iii) 0.01% twitter. Only 26% of respondents know government's internet based communication and information media, less than those having internet-based handphone (42%). It can be interpreted that: (i) the coverage of internet-based government information media socialization has not been optimum; and (ii) poor citizen community's digital access to website-based government and social media is still low.

How is literacy level of poor group in the dissemination of internet-based public policy information and new media? Out of 63% respondents admitting knowing Government's website, FB, Instagram, and Twitter, 13% have ever participated in information media in the form of commenting on and posting information. This data shows that community's respond is not too high. Why? Digital divide factor putatively causes it, in which only 42% of respondents have internet-based handphone. In addition, it is also due to the government's communication pattern using actor network less optimally for public information literacy among poor people group.

What are communication pattern and key component contributing to the process of interpreting information in poor group? The communication pattern intended in this article is how the relationship is between RT (neighborhood association) community members in acquiring information or being information source in their community. Viewed from social network pattern in community with the large proportion of poor people in 3 areas, there are some types of citizens' position in community network: (i) citizen group treated as information reference by its community (5% of total population); (ii) citizen undertaking information exchange with low frequency (30%); (iii) citizen conducting high information exchange (5%); (iv) group conducting one-way communication as information searcher (26%); (v) group not connected at all to its community (23%).

In group 1, 5% of citizens are treated as information reference in their community. They serve as information broker or intermediaries. Viewed from respondent profile, there are identical features making them considered as information reference by community: (i) having internet-based handphone; (ii) knowing city government's social media; (iii) 40-50 years old; (iv) close to governmental structure, for example: head of RT, Civil Servants; (v) having permanent job. This data shows that the status of closeness to government still becomes added value to an individual to be trusted by its community, so that they are considered as information source by community. The small proportion of information broker potentially reinforces the assumption [4] that elite and centralistic domination will remain to occur even in Government 5.0 era.

Meanwhile, group IV is the one not connected, despite in a setting closest to the community. It means that they have never asked or reported information related to government policy in their community, including poverty policy. They have never been asked for or received report from their neighbors about less clarity of a government policy's enactment in the community. They have identical features: (i) having no HP or having no internet-supported HP, (ii) not native people but those renting house in this neighborhood, and (iii) most of them are more than 55 years old.

In the three population areas, digital divide impacts on the poor group's inadequate access to network. In this neighborhood association (RT) community network with the largest number of poor citizens, majority communication pattern relies on direct face-to-face meeting pattern. The communication channel most frequently accessed to acquire information on government policy related to their direct need, including poverty policy: (i) neighborhood association meeting (57%), (ii) discussion with neighbor (56%), (iii) Religion Forum Meeting (34%), (iv) Social Forum Meeting (28%), (v) discussion with friends (21%), (vi) written announcement, poster, billboard (20%), (vii) newspaper (10%), (viii) WA group (10%), (ix) friend's FB (9%); (x) City Government's FB (5%), (xi) City government's IG, (xii) Friend's IG (3%); (xiii) City Government's Website (3%), (xiv) Public website (1%), (xv) Government-owned Twitter (1%), and (xvi) Friends' twitter. Considering the media preference accessed by poor group, it means that the role of broker information is very strategic.

The strategic role of information broker in this research includes: (i) answering citizen's question; (ii) receiving citizen's complaint report; (iii) being the connector of government to citizens to deliver information; and (iv) giving data report to government when there is poverty grant. Information on poverty policy often needed by citizens, according to respondents includes: (1) type of poverty grants (94%), (2) precondition of grant and how to deal with poverty grant (70%), (3) reporting fraud and deviation concerning poverty grant (48%), and (4) other information. The types of poverty grant wanted are: (i) health grant (76%); (ii) business capital grant (74%); (iii) job training (66%); (iv) housing grant (65%); and (v) health grant (61%). Information broker explains that the information the citizens ask for is not accessible completely in government-owned website or social media; thus, sometimes citizens should remain to go to Village (Kelurahan) Government to answer their question. It means that information delivered through government's social media and website has not fulfilled citizen's need, thereby contributing to the society's lower access to government's social media and government in research location. Such the condition is analyzed using the ANT procedure to find problems and recommendations [19]:

a) Problematization

Whether or not government actors, in this case Regional Apparatus Organization (OPD), and non-government actor have formulated the problem to be solved jointly using ICT for public service and government information publication, including information on poverty alleviation policy, so that all actors involved are bound to a centralized controlling mechanism called "obligatory passage point (OPP). The result of interview with OPD and information broker shows that there has been no specific directory for individual OPDs displaying poverty information corner according to the affairs it deal with. However, information system from Regional Development Planning Agency is being constructed today

b) Interassessment

Is there program or activity dealt with specifically through ICT technology to build government and non-government actors' attractiveness involved in networking? During the research process, there has been no poverty program managed specifically integrated cross-OPD and sustainably, supported with specific directory of online-based community.

c) Enrolment

Is there an improved participation of other actors joining the networking? There has been potential support from Blogger Village and IT Village, despite no coordination with City Government synergistically and sustainably.

d) Mobilization

Is a larger alliance established to involve other actors giving support indirectly? There has been CSR forum potentially to be involved in dealing with digital divide to poor community group. However, during the research process, there has been potential mobilization.

4 Conclusions

From the result of research, some conclusions can be drawn as the answer to the research problem: (1) the problem encountered by poor group in responding to the internet-based communication model established by government is digital divide. The implication is that the government should anticipate the problem of digital divide among poor group in collaboration with CSR of business world and IT community and Blogger Village; (2) the literacy level of poor group in disseminating internet- and social media-based public policy information is still low. The implication is that city government should improve the poor group's literacy through family members or network community closest to poor family, for example, Neighborhood Association (RT) community, job community, religion community, and other social community; (3) communication pattern and process of interpreting information among poor groups are hybrid in nature, rather than ICT-oriented. The implication is that government should improve communication media design innovation and special communication network for poor group and information on poverty policy; (4) key component contributing to the interpretation on information among poor groups is information broker. The role of information broker is still very desirable in government 5.0 era. Internet-based government information media should be developed into the more inclusive one.

Theoretical contribution of this research lies on the finding of preposition about information broker or intermediaries constituting important component in government communication 5.0, through creating mixed communication platform confronting the perspectives of policy actor and target group. The second preposition, the closeness of position to government structure still underlies the community's trust in Information Broker figure, thereby is still vulnerable to strengthen elitist value of information among poor group even in government 5.0 era. Further studies are recommended to be done concerning systematical review on the studies on government communication for poverty alleviation among poor groups viewed from government 5.0 perspective.

Acknowledgment

Thank to Republic of Indonesia's Ministry of Research, Technology, and High Education for funding this research and this article publication. Thank also to Regional Development Information Center of LPPM of Universitas Sebelas Maret for supporting this article dissemination.

References

[1] Keidanren. Society 5.0, Co-creating the future. Retrieved from http://www.keidan-ren.or.jp, 2018.

[2] K. Sanders, M.J.C. Crespo, C.H. Bacha. "Communicating Governments: A Three-Country Comparison of How Governments Communicate with Citizens". *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp. 523– 547, 2011.

[3] M.E. Milakovich. "Digital governance and collaborative strategies for improving service quality". In KMIS, Proceedings of the International Conference on Knowledge Management and Information Sharing, pp. 109-118. INSTICC Press, 2014.

[4] K.M. Johansson, T. Raunio. "Government communication in a comparative perspective" in Johansson, K.M. & Nygren, G. (eds.) *Close and distant: Political executive–media relations in four countries,* pp. 127-148, 2019.

[5] C. Larasati. Kesenjangan Digital di Indonesia Masih Tinggi. Medcom.id. Retrieved from https://www.medcom.id, 2018.

[6] C. Sparks, C. "What is the "Digital Divide" and why is it Important?". *Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture,* Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 27-46, 2013.

[7] Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia dan Polling Indonesia. Laporan Survei Nasional Penetrasi dan Profil Perilaku Pengguna Internet 2018. Retrieved from https://apjii.or.id, 2019.

[8] R. Alika. Kesenjangan Ekonomi Dunia Melebar Imbas Era Didital. katadata.co.id. Retrieved from https://katadata.co.id, 2019.

[9] World Bank. Teknologi Digital: Potensi Besar Pembangunan Belum Menjangkau Empat Miliar Orang yang Tidak Memiliki Akses Internet. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org, 2016.

[10] M. Njoki, F. Wabwoba, F. "The Role of ICT in Social Inclusion: A Review of Literature." *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, Vol. 4, No. 12, pp. 5-6, 2015.

[11] A. Flor, A. ICT pathways to poverty reduction: empirical evidence from East and Southern Africa. Information Technology for Development. Retrived from https://doi.org/10.1080/ 02681102.2014.923595, 2014.

[12] Bornbaum et al. "Exploring the function and effectiveness of knowledge brokers as facilitators of knowledge translation in health-related settings: a systematic review and thematic analysis." *Implementation Science*, Vol. 10, No. 162, pp. 1-12., 2015.

[13] C. Fisher, I. and Vogel. Locating the power of in-between: How research brokers and intermediaries support evidence based pro-poor policy and practice. UK: The Institute of Development Studies. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net, 2008.

[14] M. Sagsan, H.C. Sozen. "The Brokerage Roles in The Organizational Networks and Manipulation of Information Flow". *International journal of eBusness and eGovernment Studies,* Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 41-51, 2010.

[15] B. Landis, et al. "The Paradox of Agency: Feeling Powerful Reduces Brokerage Opportunity Recognition yet Increases Willingness to Broker." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 103, No. 8, pp. 929–938, 2018.
[16] R.S. Burt, M. Kilduff, S. Tasselli. "Social network analysis: Foundations and frontiers on advantage" *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 64, pp. 527–547, 2013.
[17] A. Nasution. "Poverty Measurement in BPS-Statistics Indonesia: The Actor Network Theory (ANT) Approach." *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*,Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 154-170, 2018.
[18] J. Voeten, G. de Groot, J. de Haan, J., N. Roome. "Understanding Responsible Innovation in Small Producers' Clusters in Vietnam through Actor Network Theory." *The European Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 289–307, 2013.
[19] M. Callon. Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay', in John Law (ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge*, pp. 196-223. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.